(52)

Previous references.

File No. 1–06

1906-07

(Police)

Serial Nos. 21, 64, 109, 262, 289, 361, 420, 426.

Later references.

Police 1–07. Sls 223, 261, 354-6, 357, 362, 364-6 etc.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 21, 64, 109, 261, 262, 289, 361, 420, 421 & 426.

Part B. for May 1907

SUBJECT.

Petitions

Table of Contents

21 From the Private Secretary to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore No 144 dt 14-7 1906

Forwards for disposal a petition from Subraha manya bhatta of Tarikere Complaining that some of his documents and property taken possession of by the Police have not as yet been restored to him, that some of the documents have become time-barred and pra...

G. R. S. 58

for orders as to whether he should hold the Goast or Panchaya who caused the things to be taken from his possession responsible for his loss

To the Dy Commr through the I.G. of Police
No 6317 dt 1/8/06

Forwards the above petition for report

109 from Subrahmanya bhatta. dt 8.10.1906
Reminder petition

261 To the I.G. of Police No J2290 dt 1-2-07
Calls for the memo submitted by the Dy Commr to him.

262 From the same No 5385/590 dt 4.2.1907
Forwards the memo referred to in the above with the records.

289 To the Distt magistrate Kasaragod No 2507 dt 20/2/07
Requests that the explanation of Mr Nadiga Subbarao may be obtained and forwarded at an early date.

No J2508 dt 20-2-07. Forwards copy of the above to the I.G. of Police.

From the Distt magistrate Kasaragod No 645 dt 9/4/07
Forwards the explanation of Mr Nadiga Subba Rao with records

G. R. S. 11]

1906.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Police)

NOTES.

File. No 1 of 06-

FILE HEADING.

Petitions

From

The Privati Secy. to H. H. the Maharaja

No. 144/1 Dated 14.7.06 Received 16.7.06

Diary No. J171 | Enclos. 1 | Spare Copies. .. | Serial No. 21

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Forwards for disposal a petition from Subbahmanyabhatta of Jarikere complaining that ~~certain~~ some of his documents and property taken possession of by the Police has not as yet been restored to him, that some of the documents have become time barred & praying for orders as to whether he should hold the Govt. or Panchayat who caused the things to be taken away from his possession, responsible for his loss.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Subo. ~~for orders~~ with a draft endorsement to the petitioner that Govt. is unable to advise him in the matter.

See 27.7.06

27.7.06

27.7.06

It is not so much a case that the petitioner wants, as some

Notes—First sheet.

MGCPB—30,000—17-2-05.

G.R.S. 12j
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. 1 of 1906-07

Serial No.

enquiries of
Remedy for alleged loss of [redacted]
documents & vessel.
3. As it is stated that upon taking
to the Dabul authorities produced no
effect, the petr may be forwarded
to the Dy Com^r (thro' the Collr) for
a report.
to 2 D C^r

29.7.06
Ber
30.7.06

4
Yes. such petitions should
not be summarily rejected

30/7/06

5 (all for a report agendum)

30/7/06

Ber
30.7.06

6 Subd. with a draft as directed

B.G.
31.7.06
31.7.06

7 Issue Ber
31.7.06

6 4 Draft issued

no. J 317 D/ 1.8.06

'09 Petition D/ 8.10.06 from Subrahmanya
Chetty of Tanjore

This is a reminder petition

Note—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

Police File No. of 190 6-07

Serial No.

8

Subo. May the report called for from the Dy. Comr. be awaited?

BS. SH
29.10.06 29/10/06.

9 Call upon Orlons to expedite his reply

Ahmed 29/10

29/10

10 Subo with a draft as discussed.

Reminder issued 30.10.06.

30.10.06 SH

29/10

Misc No 17
26-1-07

J 187.

3rd Reminder

4

Police file no III 4 of 06-7

J.R.S. 45]

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. J2154, dated the 23rd Jan 1907

(Police)

REPLY.

No. 190, dated the 26th January 1907.

From:
D. Devaraj urs Esqre
Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District

To

The Deputy Commissioner
of the Kadur Dt.
Chikmagalur

Police
Reports

To

The Secretary to the Government of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore, General and Revenue Dept.

SUBJECT.

Calls for a report on the petition of Subrahmanya Bhatta of Tarikere as regards the return of certain documents belonging to him.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM.

The undersigned is directed to invite attention to the marginally noted communication and to request that the General and Revenue Secretariat may be informed, in the column opposite, of the cause of delay in furnishing a reply and of the approximate date on which a reply may be expected.

No J317, dated 1-8-06

He is also to request that the General and Revenue Secretariat may be favoured with a reply to this reminder not later than the ~~5th February~~ 7.

By Order

for Secretary

In reply to his Reminder no: J. 2154 of the 23rd instant I have the honour to state that a detailed memo explaining the circumstances was submitting with this No: 309 of 14.1.07 to the Inspector General of Police — as per my No: 317 of 1-8-06. — D. D.

for Dy Commissioner

* Previous reminder.

7.12.06

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

Police File No. 1 of 190 6-07

5

Serial

V The Dy. Comr. states in his docket no. 190 D/ 26.1.07 ~~states~~ that the report called for was subd to the I.G. of Police to be sent to Govt. Subd. with a draft to the I.G. of Police.

B.G. 29.1.07. SN 29/1/07 13 Jmes

29/1/07

261 To The I.G. of Police no. T 2290 D/ 1/2.07

Calls for the memo referred to in the above by the Dy. Comr.

262 From The I.G. of Police no. 5385/590 D/ 4.2.07

Forwards the memo referred on the above with the records

14 The memo subd. by the Dt. Magte through the I.G. of Police gives a more or

Note—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12J
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. of 1906-07

Serial No.

less complete history of the case. The proceedings, both of the Police and the Court concerned, seem to have been conducted in a disorderly and irresponsible manner. No records evidencing the transmission of the properties in question from the Police office to the court and their return either to the Police office or the owner there of are forthcoming. It is, however, stated on page 6 of the memo that certain circumstances go to show that some of the properties have been restored to the persons concerned though there is no dakhala for such restoration. Each of the points raised admit of ~~other~~ explanations which with equal probability point to a view, diametrically opposite to that taken by the Dt. Magte

5 Cont'd on Cir. ind. Reference & Reports
re D/2

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

Serial No.	Circumstances relied on.	Alternative Explanation
	1. The failure on the part of the petitioner to petition former Magistrates for the return of his property	This seems to be contradicted by the reverse of page 3 of the memo, though it is stated therein that the petitioner could not produce any document for having pressed his claim earlier. It is possible and even probable that he sent his petitions by ordinary post in which case he could not have obtained any receipt from the post office or any acknowledgement from the several addressees.
	2. The absence of the right counterfoils of the property reports from the records	Points 2 and 3 are susceptible of different

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

Police File No. of 1906-07

Serial No.		
	3. The absence from the court of the properties ticked off thus "V" in the left counterfoils of the said report.	explanations likewise. Possibly when some of the properties mentioned in report were found missing the report itself might have been tampered with by some unscrupulous hand, which would also have taken the necessary precaution to dispose of the right counterfoils of the said report.
	4. The presence in the court of only those articles not so ticked off.	This, in the absence of other evidence, does not prove anything beyond the patent fact that the remaining properties are missing.

15 N.B. It is not known why one portion of the property was returned to the persons concerned while the other portion was allowed to remain in the Court.

16 The presumption arrived

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12J
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. of 190 6-07

Serial No.

at by the Dt. Magte. is by no means conclusive and therefore does not deserve to be completely relied upon In the concluding para of the memo the Dt. Magte. himself admits that it is not possible to state definitely how the missing properties in question have been disposed of.

17 The remarks of Mr. Nadig Subba Rao (the then Amildar of Tarikere) on the Memo:—

"I was in charge of the Tarikere Taluk until 22-5-03 i.e. 3 months and 9 days after the order on the B Sheet was passed by me as Amildar Magistrate. I don't feel able to explain at this distance of time why the case remained pending until I left the Taluk without seeing the Court Diary to refresh my memory. I hope Govt. will kindly give me an

SPB—50,000—23-10-05

Serial No.

opportunity to explain myself
(Sd.) N. Subba Rao

Bangalore
2-2-07.

Dt. to the I.G. of Police

1st Subo. for orders. The Dt. Magte.
B.G. 14.2.07 may be asked to send the Court
diaries to Mr. Nadig Subba Rao, ~~to enable him to explain the~~ as desired by him

SW 15/2/07

10 The Court-diaries may be ordered to be sent to Mr. Subba Rao & his explanation called for.

Seen
20 W 14/2/07
15-2-07

W 15/2/07

21 Subo. with a draft to the Dt. Magte.
B.G. 16.2.07 SW 16/2

22 Issued W 16/2/07

Seen
21/2

89 To the Dt. Magte. Kadur no T 25-07 dt 20-2-07
Requests that the explanation of Mr. Nadig Subba Rao may be obtained and forwarded at an early date
no T 2508 dt 20.2.07
Forward copy of the above to the I.G. of Police.

Note—Contn. sheet :

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. of 190 6-07

Serial No. From

361 The Dt. Magte. Kadiri no. 645 Dt 9.4.07

Forwards the explanation of Mr. Nadig Subba Rao with the records.

23 Mr. Subba Rao states that he cannot offer any explanation as the case in question finds no place in the Court Diary and that he does not remember anything in the matter. Subd. for orders

B.G. 7.4.07 DN 18/4/07

24

The facts of the case are fully explained in the Dt. Magte's memo.

2 All the property seized was sent to the Taluk Police Office, but there is no voucher to show that from the Taluk Police Office the property was sent to the Court. The fact that some of the articles were found in the Court seems to show that all the property was sent to the Court.

3. Head Constable Mr. C. Krishna Rao in his report on the case to the District Magte (quoted in the Dt. Magte's memo) surmises that the missing articles were returned to the per-

Note—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12J
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. of 1906-07

Serial No.

But ~~This~~ it is difficult to decide this point either way. One thing however ~~seems clear~~ seems clear. The registered work in the Builder's Court seems to have been done in a very haphazard manner.

(a) The 'B' report was received on 18-1-03 and ~~the~~ the case was noted 6/3-2-03, but no Mis. Case Number was given and no entries were made in the Diary or Mis. Reg^r. (b) The undated Stt. ~~in the handwriting~~ (No 7/14 in the record) seems to be the Stt. referred to by Mr Subba Rao in his order of ~~the~~ 13th February, but the Stt. ~~was~~ is not in Mr Subba Rao's handwriting ~~& is not~~ he has not even initialled and dated it - (c) As the 13th Feby Mr. Subba Rao ordered the case to be taken on the regular file, but this was not done - (d) The property mentioned in the case that was received with Court has not been noted in the Property Reg^r. All these are irregularities which could not have been possible if the early Rules that his registers were written up & signed from day to day, as he was bound to do -

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. of 1906-07

Serial No.

4 ~~The Chiefs~~. Here irregularities may be pointed out to the Chiefs & the Jt. C. informed that the articles the restoration of which he claims cannot be traced.

Ker 18-4-07

25 Ker) I think this may be done. Please submit draft to both the Councillors. 21-4-07

Police & Jail - 4

26 Put up draft.

Ker 23/4

27 Subd. with a draft order and a draft endorsement.

BG. 25-4-07

28 Put up neat copy of the draft & submit the Councillors

Ker 26/4

subd) 29

It is poor consolation to the aggrieved party to know that the work of the Police & the Magistrate is found faulty with. It may be ordered that the value of the missing property should be recovered from the Police Officer concerned

Note—Contn. sheet 1

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

Serial No.

and paid to the Petr
the Jagp Office should
take steps to prevent a
recurrence of such
~~disgraceful~~ irregular proceedings
in the Office Deptt.

I approve of the Deptt
with the above alteration

KRM
27/4/07

30

Mr. Dix as above, & submit
to the Govt. in draft to
Revenue —

M
27/4/07

31

add
draft modified & submitted to the 1st Court
the Dewan —

32

ku
27/4

29.4.1907

The draft may be approved.

4806
29/5/07

M/29/5/07

ku
1895

33

Print

29/5/1907

34

Draft sent to the Govt
Dewan to-day

M/
29/5

GPE—100,000—03-10-05.

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. of 190 6-07

15

Serial No. 35 issue

This is put up as per Endt 25/5

36 Put up as sent to-day.

lw 29/5

issue 27/5

421 To The D.G. of Police, the Dt. Magte. Kaora & the Registrar, Chief Court no J3585-87 dt/ 29.5.07

Directs the D.G. to recover the cost fee of the property lost from the Police officers concerned & pay the same to the petitioner and observes that the magisterial work of the Taluka Auxiliary court seems to have been done in a haphazard manner.

Filed 4/6/07

421 From The Petitioner. Petition dt/ 12.5.07 a reminder to sl no. 21

37 Subo. with a draft endorsement to the petitioner.

D.G. 30.5.07 31.5.07

38 Issue lw 31/5

426 To The Petitioner no. J 3629 dt/ 31.5.07

Informs him that orders have been issued to the D.G. of Police to recover the value of his lost property from the Police officers concerned and to deliver the same to him.

Seen

NOTE—Contn sheet

(1000) 18-1-07

J 171 /

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

No. 144

Mysore, 14th July 1906

file no. 1706-07
sl no. 21

Petition as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is

mmb 15-7-06

transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja

66/7

of Mysore, General and Revenue Department (Br: III), Bangalore, for disposal.

No. 94 of 06-07.

By Order,

Macnaghten

I. C. S.

Private Secretary

to H. H. The Maharajah of Mysore.

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY
94
13 JUL 1906
TO H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

File no. 1706-07

13.7.06

ತಾಳಕುಂ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಪಟ್ಟ ಉಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗೆ

2

ಸಂಗತಿ :- ಯಾವುದಂ ಕಂಪನಿ ಎಂಬ ನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೋರಿ. ಈ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿ

ಕೆಳಗೆ ಕಂಡ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೆಳಗೆ ಬರೆದಿದೆ. ಅವಶ್ಯಕ ದಸ್ತಾವೇಜುಗಳನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ

ಕಾಗದ ನಂ/೧೦-೭-೨೦ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿರುವ ಅಂಶ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಕೆಳಗೆ ಕಂಡ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೆಳಗೆ ಬರೆದಿದೆ. ಅವಶ್ಯಕ ದಸ್ತಾವೇಜುಗಳನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ

ಕಾಗದ ನಂ/೧೦-೭-೨೦ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿರುವ ಅಂಶ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಕೆಳಗೆ ಕಂಡ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೆಳಗೆ ಬರೆದಿದೆ. ಅವಶ್ಯಕ ದಸ್ತಾವೇಜುಗಳನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ

ಕಾಗದ ನಂ/೧೦-೭-೨೦ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿರುವ ಅಂಶ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಕೆಳಗೆ ಕಂಡ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೆಳಗೆ ಬರೆದಿದೆ. ಅವಶ್ಯಕ ದಸ್ತಾವೇಜುಗಳನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ

ಕಾಗದ ನಂ/೧೦-೭-೨೦ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿರುವ ಅಂಶ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಕೆಳಗೆ ಕಂಡ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೆಳಗೆ ಬರೆದಿದೆ. ಅವಶ್ಯಕ ದಸ್ತಾವೇಜುಗಳನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ

ಕಾಗದ ನಂ/೧೦-೭-೨೦ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿರುವ ಅಂಶ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಕೆಳಗೆ ಕಂಡ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೆಳಗೆ ಬರೆದಿದೆ. ಅವಶ್ಯಕ ದಸ್ತಾವೇಜುಗಳನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ

ಕಾಗದ ನಂ/೧೦-೭-೨೦ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿರುವ ಅಂಶ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಕಳವಳಕ್ಕೆಂತೊಳ್ಳಿತು ಪಡಿಚಿಕ್ಕಿಸ್ಸ —— —

ನಾನಮ ಅಬುಕರಿಯು ಎಂತಂತ ಅಬುವರಿ ಸಾಲಿಕರಂಬಾಳ್ವಿಕಳ್ಳವರಿಂ
ಲೀವಾದೀವಿನಿ ಅಬುಳಿ ಅಬುಳಿ — ಅಬುಸುಂಬಮುಂದ್ರ ವಾದಕಾಂಕಳ್ಳುಂ ಕ್ರುಸಳ್ಳು- ಮೊಂ
ಅಳ್ಳಿಕಿನವಳ್ಳು ಶೆಳ್ಳಿಗದು ಕೆಳ್ಳಿಂಡಲ್ಲೊಳ್ಳಿರ ದುಸ್ತೋರಸಳ್ಳಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬಳ್ಳಿ ಅಬುದ್ರಿಪ್ಪ —
ವುಳ್ಳಿ. ಅಬುದುಳಿತಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಅಬುಳಿಕ್ಕೆ-ಳಿಕಿನಳ್ಳಿ ಗಿಂಎಂಬುಂದಿಳ್ಳಿ ಗಿಂಎಂಬ ಕೊಪ್ಪ ಅಬು
ಕನಕಂಎಬುಳಿಬುಳ್ಳಿಸ್ಕಿಳ್ಳಿ - ಅಬುವಂಬುಳಗ್ಗು ವನ್ನಿಬ್ರಾಂಕಳ್ಳಿಯಿದಾನ-ಪುಬುಳ್ಳಿ.
ರಾಂಎಬುನಳ್ಳಿಸಿ ನಾಂಪಿಕ್ಕಿಂಎಂಬುಳ್ಳಿಂಲಾದಲ್ಲಿ-ಕೆಳ್ಳಿಳಿಂಎಂಬುಂಆಕಿಕಿದಪುಬುಳಿಂಬುಳಿ
ಅಬುಳ್ಳಿಳಿಬು ಎಬುಂಎಬ್ಬಿಸಾಂಕಿರಕಬುಂಎಂಅಬುಳಿಬುಳಿಕಿ ಬಾಂಳಿಬುವಲ ವೆಳ್ಳಿಸಳ್ಳಿ
ವಳ್ಳಿ-ಬುಕಳಬುಂಡಿ ಕೆಳ್ಳಿಳಿಬುವಳಿಂಗದಂಎಂ ಕ್ರುಸಳ್ಳಿ- ಅಬುದ್ರಿಪ್ಪ-ಅಬು ವ್ರುಸಳ್ಳಿಂ
ದಾಂಳಿಂರಂಬುಳ್ಳಿ ಗಿಂಎಂಬು ಕ್ಲಿಪ್ಪ-ಳಿಂಬುಳಿಳ್ಳಿಂಬುಳಿಂಎಬುವಳಿಂಕಿ ಕಳ್ಳಿಂಬಾಂಕೆಳ್ಳಿಂಡಕಿಳಿಬು
ವ್ರುಂಬುಎಂಕಿಂಬುಳಿಂಬು ಅಬುಳಿಂಕ್ಲಿ- ಅಬುಳಿಂಕ್ಲಿಳಿಂಬುಳಿಂಕಿ- ಅಬುಳ್ಳಿಳಿಗಿಂಎಂಬುಂದನಳ್ಳಿ
ಳಿಂಗಿಂಎಂಬುಳಿಂಬ್ಬಿನಬು-ಕಂದಿಂಎಬುಳಿದ್ದ್ರಿ. ನೆಳ್ಳಿ ಎಬುನೆಳ್ಳಿ- - - - ——— ———

ಎಬುಂಳ್ಳಿಗಿಂಎಂಬುಳಿಂಬ್ಬಿನಬು ಅಬುಳಿಂಎಂಕಿ ಅಬುದಿಳ್ಳಿಳಿಕಿಂಎಬುಳಿಂಬ
ದಡ್ರಿಂಳ್ಳಿಬ್ಬಳಿಸಿ ಕೆಳ್ಳಿಗದನಾಂಸಿಕ್ಕಿನಳ್ಳಿಸ್ಕಾ ಎಬುದಕಾಂಬು- ಭೈಂಸಗಕಿನಳ್ಳಿಕಿ-ನಂ
ಸಬುಂದ್ರಳಂಪೆತ್ತಿ ಗಿಸಿಂಕಿಕಿದ್ದಿಬು- ಕನ್ನಳ್ಳಿಂ ಅಬು ದಿಪ್ಪಳ್ತ್ರಿ ಕಿಪ್ಪಿಂಎಂಕಿಕಿಂಕಿಳಿಂಕಿಳಿಕಿಂಬು- ಸೆಂಎಬುಳಿ
ಡಿ ಅಂದಕಿಳಿಸಿ-ಸಂಎಂಬುಂದ್ರಳಂಪೆತ್ತಿ ಕಿವನಿಕಿಂಕಿಸ್ಕಿದಾಂಬು- ಎಬುಳಿಳಿ ಡಿಂಳಿಳಿಬುಎಂದ್ರಿಳಿ
ಳಿಬು ಸಬುಂಎಂಬುದ ಡಿಂಳಿಬು ಕಿವನಿಕಿಂಕಿಸ್ಕಿದಾಂಬು- ಎಬುಳಿಳಿ ಡಿಂಳಿಳಿಬುಎಂದ್ರಿಳಿಳಿಬು ಸಬುಂಎಂಬುದ
ಅಬುಂಎಬುಳಿಳಿಬುಳಿಕಿನ್ನೆಳ್ಳಿಳಿಸ್ಕಿಳಿಳಿಬುಳಿಂಕ್ಲಿಂಎಂಬುಳಿಂಕಿಳಿಂಕಿಳಿಂಕಿ

ಪ್ರಕೃತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಭವಿಸುವ ಪ್ರಕೃತಿ ವಿಕೋಪಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂಕಂಪವು ಒಂದು. ಭೂಮಿಯ ಒಳಗಿನ ಪದರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಉಂಟಾಗುವ ಹಠಾತ್ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳಿಂದ ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮೇಲ್ಮೈ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಪನಗಳು ಉಂಟಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಇದನ್ನೇ ಭೂಕಂಪ ಎಂದು ಕರೆಯುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಭೂಕಂಪದ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಬಿಂದುವಿನಿಂದ ಹೊರಹೊಮ್ಮುವ ಕಂಪನಗಳು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮೇಲ್ಮೈ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲೆಗಳ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಚಲಿಸುತ್ತವೆ. ಈ ಅಲೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಭೂಕಂಪನ ಅಲೆಗಳು ಎಂದು ಕರೆಯುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಭೂಕಂಪನ ಅಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರು ವಿಧಗಳಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳೆಂದರೆ ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಅಲೆಗಳು, ದ್ವಿತೀಯ ಅಲೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಭೂಮೇಲ್ಮೈ ಅಲೆಗಳು. ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಅಲೆಗಳು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಒಳಗಿನಿಂದ ಹೊರಹೊಮ್ಮುವ ಮೊದಲ ಅಲೆಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಇವು ಘನ, ದ್ರವ ಮತ್ತು ಅನಿಲ ಮಾಧ್ಯಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಚಲಿಸುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವು ಅತ್ಯಂತ ವೇಗವಾಗಿ ಚಲಿಸುವ ಅಲೆಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಇವು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮೇಲ್ಮೈ ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ತಲುಪಿದಾಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಪನಗಳನ್ನು ಉಂಟುಮಾಡುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಒಳಗಿನ ಪದರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡ್ಡಲಾಗಿ ಚಲಿಸುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವು ಘನ ಮಾಧ್ಯಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಚಲಿಸುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವು ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಅಲೆಗಳಿಗಿಂತ ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿ ಚಲಿಸುತ್ತವೆ. ಭೂಮೇಲ್ಮೈ ಅಲೆಗಳು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮೇಲ್ಮೈ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಚಲಿಸುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವು ಅತ್ಯಂತ ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿ ಚಲಿಸುವ ಅಲೆಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಇವು ಭೂಕಂಪದ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಬಿಂದುವಿನಿಂದ ಹೊರಹೊಮ್ಮುವ ಕಂಪನಗಳಿಂದ ಉಂಟಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮೇಲ್ಮೈ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಚಲಿಸುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಒಳಗಿನ ಪದರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಚಲಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವು ಭೂಕಂಪನ ಅಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ವಿನಾಶಕಾರಿ ಅಲೆಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಇವು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮೇಲ್ಮೈ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪಾರ ಹಾನಿಯನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮೇಲ್ಮೈ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲೆಗಳ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಚಲಿಸುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮೇಲ್ಮೈ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡ್ಡಲಾಗಿ ಚಲಿಸುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮೇಲ್ಮೈ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಚಲಿಸುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಒಳಗಿನ ಪದರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಚಲಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವು ಭೂಕಂಪನ ಅಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ವಿನಾಶಕಾರಿ ಅಲೆಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಇವು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮೇಲ್ಮೈ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪಾರ ಹಾನಿಯನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡುತ್ತವೆ.

190 6

No. J 171

Name of Petitioner Subramanyabhatta

Village Tarikere

Taluk Tarikere

District Kadur

Date of Arzi 9.7.06

Date of Receipt 16.7.06

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure

File no. 1906-07 ನಂ ೨೯

SI no. 21

ABSTRACT

The petitioner lived at Tarikere with his brother-in-law Subba Rao, Shanbhog of Nerlakere and was looking after his affairs. In June 1902 a cousin of this Subba Rao, Pancappa by name complained to the Police that certain records and vessels of his had been stolen by the petitioner Subba Rao. Thereupon the house of Subba Rao was searched and the records and vessels found there were taken to the Police office

The petitioner frequently
urged the Police to decide the
matter soon and restore his
property to him; but getting no
relief he petitioned the Police
officer in the Jan 1905 and got
a reply that his property had
been sent to the Taluk
Magistrate. On his represent-
ing the matter to the Tk.
Magte. both in person and by
petition that officer dismissed
the case on 10.6.05 and ordered
the property to be restored to
the accused. But, however,
the property was not restored
to the petitioner and he
continues to constantly petition
the Tk. Magte and the Dy. Comr.
On 30.6.06 he was informed
that if he had not received
his property back he ought to
have complained to the
division at the time and
that there was no property
in the court belonging to the petitioner
claimed by him on that date.
The records taken from the petitioner's
house contained documents
relating to monetary transaction
to the extent of Rs 2000 and also
other documents relating to the
property of Subba Rao to the extent
of Rs 5000 which had been misappropriated
by Pinnappa during the former's minority
so the documents were taken away from them
they were prevented from taking action on them.
The documents have become time barred. Consequently
the petitioner & Subba Rao have sustained great

loss and pray for orders as to whether
they are to look to the Govt. or Pinnappa
responsible for this loss.

The above is a true copy
of the petition of the petitioner.

File no. 19 06-07
sl no. 64

8

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

No. J 317 DR 1-8-06 Pett-06 Cen. 1

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. J 171 dated the 9th July 1906 received ~~at the Dewan's Office~~ from Subrahmanyabhat of Jarikere, complaining that some of his documents and property taken possession of by the Police at the instance of one Panimpa have not as yet been returned, &c

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures,~~ to the Dy. Comr of the Kadur Dt., thro' the S.P. of Police in Mysore, for report.

2-8-06

By order,

1-8-1906

Respectfully Extd by

31.7-06

Secretary.

BANGALORE,

The 189

Original

J 8/69
File no. 1906-07
Sl no. 109 9

[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

ಸಾಲಾಂತಿಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾಯಿಕ್ಕಿಂದಿಳ್ಳ ಮೂಂಡ್ಡನು ಮಾಂಡಲ್ಪಿ - ಪ್ರಾಯಿಂದ

ಕ್ಕಿಂದಾಳ್ಳ - ಕಾಂನಂ ನುಂಡಿಪ್ಪರವನಮೀಂದಿನ ಅಂದು ವಿಂದಿಳ್ಳಯಿಂಸ್ಸಂಸ್ಸಿ

ನ್ನ ಕಾಂಶರಿಕೊಂಡ್ಡಿಪ್ಪರಾಂಯಿಂತಿ. ಗಂಗ್ಗಮಾಂಲು ನಳ್ಳಿಪ್ಪನನನಿಕ್ಕೆಂಯಿಕ್ಕಿ

ಕ್ಕೆಂಂಡ್ಡಲಾಲ್ಲ್ಲಾ - ನುಲ್ಲಾರಕ್ಕೆಗನಂನಮಾಲು ಕೆನದುಕ್ಕೆಂಗ್ಗಂಡು ಕ್ಕೀಂನ

ವನನಿಸುನದ ಬಂ ಕಾಂವ್ಯನ್ನಿಕ್ಕೆಂಂಡಿನುದಿ - ಮಾಂಲು ನಳ್ಳಿ ಲುಲ್ಲುಕೊಂಗಿಪ್ಪ

ವದುನ್ಮೆಂಂಡಿದಲ್ಲಿ - ನುಲ್ಲಾರಕೆ ಕಾಂಯಿ. ಕಂಡಿ ಯಮಾಂಕ್ಕಾ ನಂಂಬಿಕ್ಕೆಂಗಿ

ಡುಂಯಿಲ್ಲ್ಯ. ನನನಿನುಲ್ಲಾರದನಕೆಕ್ಕೆ - ತಿಂತಿವಂಂಬಿಲಾಲುಂಬಿಲ್ಲಾ -

ಲೂಂದಃಪ್ಪರನಳ್ಳಿಲ್ಲಾ ಅನಿಕ್ಕ ತೆಕಾಂಡಿವಿನಂಂಬುಂಳ್ಳಿ ಕಾಂಕಕಾಂನದ

ಕುಲ್ಕುನಳ್ಳಿ. ಮಳ್ಳಿ ನನನಿ ಅವಶ್ಯಕಕಾಂಸಿಬೆಕೆಂದಕ್ಕೆ-ಲವು ಅ ಕೆಂಂಡ್ಡಿನ

ಳ್ಳಿಲನದೂಲಾಲ್ಲ್ಯಾಳ್ಳಿ. ಲೂಂದಅಂಂಕನನನಿ ಕೆಳ್ಳಿ ಂಂಮಾ ನಸ್ಸಿನ್ಸಿಂಂಮಾಂ

ನಳ್ಳಿ - ಲೂಂಂಕಕ್ಕೆ ಳ್ಳಿ ಅಂಯಂಂಡಿಬಿವಿಂಂಚ್ಚಿಲ್ಲಿರ ನಿ. ಅಳ್ಳಿಂನಳ್ಳಿಂದವಲ್ಲಿ

ಬಿವಿಂಂಚ್ಚಿಲ್ಲಿರಳ್ಳಿ - ಯಂಂಗಳ್ಳವದಾದಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳ್ಳಿಲ್ಲಿನಿಕ್ಕೆಂಂಂ ——— ಂ

ಳ್ಳಿ ನಳ್ಳಿಂಪ್ಪಿಲ್ಲಿತಿನದಳ್ಳು - ಬಿಂತವನನಿಂಲಿತಿಕ್ಕೆಂಂಂ

11

G.R.S. '26]

Police File No.

Serial No. 261

Diary No. of letter replied to 71

No J 2290

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 190

To

The Inspector General of Police

in Mysore

Date of issue 1/2/07

Signed by [illegible]

Has the honor to invite his attention to Kadur Dy. Comr's no 309, dated the 14th Jany 1907, forwarding a detailed memo explaining the circumstances under which the property of one Subrahmanyabhatta of Tarikere was seized by the Police and to request that the memo may be forwarded to this office without delay

SUBJECT: JN 29-1-07

By Order

29/1/07

for Secretary

12 J 1961

1906-07 file no. 17 sl no. 26

From The Deputy Commissioner 312
Kadur District

To The Secy to the Govt. of Mysore
Genl & Rev Depts
[Through the Bangalore
Inspector General of Police in Mysore]

Dated 5th January 1907

Despatched 14/1.

Received 15/1/07

General No. 309 Operation
No.

Enclosure No. Four & one
Recd 15/1/07

Forwards a detailed memo of facts connected with the claim made by one Subrahmanya Bhatta for the return of certain documents & property seized by the Police of Tarikere Talk

No: 5385/590 Lib-Record d/ 11 February 1907.

Recorded

Inspector General of Police

MGCPB—50 records—6-12-02.

13

No. 309
Encl: Four records

Kadur District
Deputy Commissioners office
Chikmagalur 5th January
1906.

From

D. Devaraj Urs Esqre
Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District

To

K. S. Chandrasekhara Iyer,
Esqr, B.A, B.L.,
Secretary to the Govt: of Mysore
General and Rev: departments
Bangalore.
[Through the Inspector General of
Police in Mysore]

Sir,

With reference to your memorandum No: J 317 Vol: I-06 dated 1st August 1906, I have the honor to forward herewith a detailed memo of facts connected with the claim made by one Subrahmanya Bhatta for the return of certain documents and property seized by the Police of Tarikere Taluk.

The petition received with

with the above and other records as per Jericit are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

D. Devanna

Deputy Commissioner,
Kadur District

Page 1.

15

Memo

The facts of the Case regarding the claim made by one Subrahmanya Bhatta for the return of some documents seized by the Police are as follows:-

On the 24th June 1902, One Revikere Bhaniyappa, of Tarikere complained to the Police of the Tarikere Taluk, of theft of some vessels and duftors of papers from his house which he had evacuated on account of plague He suspected Subbanna (his younger brother), Subroya (his Cousin) and Subrahmanyabhatta (brother-in-law of Subroya and petitioner) of having committed the act. The Police took the Case on file as Crime No: 10/115 1901-02 under section 380 Indian Penal Code, and submitted a First Information Report to the Huildar Magistrate of Tarikere on 2nd July 1902 and after investigation of the Case submitted a "B" report to the said Magistrate on 18th January 1903. The then Huildar Magistrate Mr. Hadig

Subba Rao

Subba Rao, thereupon passed an order for notice being issued to the Complainant to appear on 13th February 1903 on which date he passed the following order:

"The Complainant is present. He says he has additional evidence to offer. There is strong enemity between the parties. The Case will be proceeded with. Vide Separate statement."

note:-

(The statement (paper No: 2/14 in the record) given by the Complainant that he has additional evidence to offer, appears to be in the Canarese hand-writing of the then Judicial Gumasta, one Lakshamanasetty, who is since dead (It is not dated. The magistrate has not passed any orders on it. He has not even initialled it.) The Case has not been taken on the magistrates' file, nor have the properties seized by the Police and produced before the Magistrate been entered in the property Register of the Court. The separate statement referred to in the magistrates' order is not in the record, and no final order seems to have been passed in the

Paper.

17

in the Case.

The vernacular Correspondence and the record of the Case as found were sent to Mr. Hadig Subba Rao now Assistant to the Inspector General of Police in Mysore, and he was asked to state, if he could remember, what final orders, if any, he passed in the Case and what orders were passed by him regarding the disposal of the properties seized and produced before the Court by the Police and whether any of the properties were delivered to any of the accused in pursuance of such orders, and if so, to whom. He replied to the effect that it was not possible to say anything about the Case.)

On 13th February 1905, i.e. 2 years after the passing of the order above referred to, on the "B" report by the then Amildar Magistrate Mr. Hadig Subba Rao, Subrahmanya bhatta, the 3rd accused (petitioner),

for

for the first time, petitioned the Amildar Magistrate, (Mr. C.R. Krishna Rao, since deceased) representing that his properties seized by the Police in June 1902, were not yet returned to him, that the Police whom he petitioned in the matter on 16th January 1905 gave him an endorsement referring him to the Amildar Magistrate to whom, they said, they had submitted the records of the Case, and praying for the early delivery of his properties to him. The Magistrate (Mr. C.R. Krishna Rao) on finding out the record of the Case in the Condition described (vide note Supra) after a search made therefor, issued a notice to the Complainant who appeared before him on 6th June 1905, after service on him of a third notice and gave a statement to the effect that he Could not prove the Case after such a long time, as his witnesses had since died. The Magistrate thereupon passed an order directing the Case to be struck off the Police file, and the properties

produced

Pdf 3.

produced in the Case to be handed over to the persons from whom they had been seized.

As for the restoration of the properties to the persons Concerned the magistrate reported to the district magistrate as follows:—

" Of the articles mentioned in Property Reports Nos: 13 and 14, the vessels Nos: 1 to 8, in the former, and duffers nos 1 to 7, in the latter ticked off thus "✓" are not to be found in the Court. When search was made for them both in the Police office and in the Court no reference was found for the same having been sent to or received in the Court or for the same having been received back in or returned to the Police office. Therefore the petitioner (Subrahmanyabhatta) was sent for and shown the remaining properties present in the Court (viz. Nos: 9, 10 and 11, brass tambige, brass Tattey (dish), and three duffers respectively, mentioned in property Report No: 13, and Nos: 8, 9 and 10

Duffers

Drafters dea mentioned in property report No: 14) He identified article No 10, brass Tattey (dish), mentioned in property report No: 13, as his, and discarred the rest. He (petitioner Subrahmanyabhatta) further represented that after the Police submitted a "B" report to the Magistrates Court, he pressed his claim to the properties 4 or 5 times, before the then Amildar Magistrate Mr: Kadig Cubba Rao, to no effect, and that when he subsegnently renewed his claim before the Amildar Magistrate Mr: J. Srinivasarao, that officer referred him to the Police. The petitioner says he has no dakhla for having so pressed his claim to and applied for the delivery to him of the properties. If his properties had not been really restored to him, he could have represented the matter to any of the former Amildar Magistrates and got redress. There seems to be ill-feeling between this accused and the Complainant and they appear to be related to each other. The right Counterfoils of the Property Reports Nos 13 and 14 are.

Pale A

are not in the record nor are they pasted to their respective originals in the Property Register maintained in the Police office, and the properties ticked off thus "✓" in the left Counterfoils (as detailed supra) are not present in Court. On making enquiries privately they appear to have been restored (to the persons Concerned). The petitioner's failure to present his application for the return of his properties, before any of the former Similar Magistrates, the absence of the right Counterfoils of the Property Reports from the Record, and the absence from the Court of the properties ticked off thus "✓" in the left Counterfoils of the said Reports, and the presence in the Court of only those articles not so ticked off go to show that the properties so ticked off have been restored to the persons Concerned though there is no dakhla for such restoration either in the Court or in the Police office. When the Police were written to and asked to send references, if any,

for

for the production of the properties before the Court, have replied that there are no such references, though there is reference for their transmission from the Town Police Station to the Taluk office, the then taluk Police Jamadar Appu Rao having acknowledged their receipt in the Town Police Station Appal Book. Jamedar Appu Rao's explanation received through the Amildar Magistrate of Chikmagalur is to the effect that all the properties in question were filled in two gunny bags, that subsequently he (Jamedar) has himself seen them lying in the Court room, and that as khla for their production before the Court is in the Police office of the Tarikere Taluk. Neither the two gunny bags nor the missing properties referred to above are to be seen in the Court room as stated by the Jamadar"

On the above report the District Magistrate ordered further overhauling of the records both in the Magistrates Court and in the Police office in view of coming across

any

Pa "a" 5

any reference which would show the disposal of the missing properties and directed that effect should be given to the order passed by the Avuilar Magistrate regarding the disposal of the properties present in Court.

In reply the Avuilar Magistrate reported that on further overhauling the records as directed he was not able to come across any reference regarding the disposal of the missing articles. He stated that from the expression "Vide separate statement" in the then Avuilar Magistrate's order on the "B" report and from the absence from the Court of the articles ticked off thus "✓" it might be presumed that the said "B" report and the properties so ticked off have already been disposed of by the then Avuilar Magistrate. As therefore no further proceedings in the matter seemed necessary, the Avuilar Magistrate

issued

issued an endorsement to the petitioner Subrahmanyabhatta accordingly handing over the properties present in the Court to the Complainant Phanindra and attaching to the record the receipt and Kudchalika taken from him.

Under the above circumstances, and as the then Judicial Gumasta is now dead, it is not possible to state definitely at this distance of time how the missing properties in question have been disposed of.

Comp[d]
HB

Dy Commissioner

Inspector Pulley Subramanya
Chargé of the Tarikere Taluk until
the 22-5-03: C.E 3 months 29 days
After the Order on the B Check was passed
by me & Amildar-Magde. I don't feel able
to Explain at this distance of time why
the Case remained pending until I left
the Taluk: without seeing the Court
Diaries to refresh my memory

I hope both will kindly pardon me &
to Explain briefly
Yours truly
Subramanya
Inspector
Bangalore 7-9-04

25

Police

G.S. 26]

File No. 1

Serial No. 289

*Diary No. of letter replied to*_____

No J 2507
Ent Records.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 190

To

The Dt Magte. of Karur

His letter no. 309, dated the 5th January 1907, forwarding a detailed memo of the facts connected with the claim made by one Subrahmanya bhatta for the return of certain documents alleged properly seized by the Police of the Tarikere Taluk.

Date of issue 20.2.07

Signed by Mr Chamberlain

In returning the memo & records received with the above, with reference to the above, has the honor to state that Mr. Nadiga Subba Rao, now dead to the

over.

SUBJECT.

26

I.G. of Police has requested that ~~to be given~~ an opportunity may be given to him of explaining why the case remained pending until he left the Taluk and that he may be allowed ~~which, it is stated, he cannot do without~~ to look into the Court proceedings to refresh his memory. The required Diaries ~~together with the~~ together with the Head of the case Diaries may therefore be sent to him at an ~~early date~~ and his explanation submitted to this office at a very early date By Grace

W. 16/2/07

for Secretary

the I.G. of Police in Mysore for communication to

Copy to Mr. Narasa Subba Rao, Head Quarter Office ~~Asst. to Hon'ble I.G. of Police in Mysore with~~ reference to his note on the memo submd. by the Dy. Comr. of Kadur

List of enclosures

J 2500 / Police 20-2-07

B.O.

W. 16/2/07

for Secretary

Copied by 19/2

Examined by SN 19/2

B.G. 22.07 SN 16/2/07

GPB—10,000—20-4-05.

J-26142

1907 File no. 1498
Sl no: 361

From The District magistrate of Madura

To The Secretary to the Govt of Madras General Land Revenue dept

Dated 9th

Despatched 11th April

Received

General No. 645
No.

Enclosure No. One Records & memo.

Forwarding records in criminal misc: case no 6/04-05 on the file of the Assistant magistrate of Tenkasi, together with the explanation memo of Mr N. Subba Rao.

28

From

D. Devaraj Urs Esquire,
District magistrate
of Kadur

To

K. V. Chandrasekharaiya Esq. B.A.B.L.
Secretary to the Govt of Mysore
General and Revenue dept

Dated Chikmagalur 9th April 1907

Sir,

Referring to your docket no J 2507/Pol 1907 dated 20th February 1907, I have the honor to forward herewith the records in Criminal misc: case no 6/04-05 on the file of the Amildar magistrate of Sankone together with the explanatory memo of Mr N. Subba Rao, Assistant to the Inspector General of Police, received with his letter no 6948/286 dated the 4th instant.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

[signature]

for District magistrate
of Kadur

Enl

Kanpalone
4th April 1907

Memo

I regret to report that I feel unable to offer any explanation as the case in question finds no place in the Court Diary Book. I may, however, state that except under unavoidable circumstances – (vernd the Huzur Jamabandi, I don't think there was any other urgent work between the 18th January and 28th May 1903), I always took care to dispose of criminal cases as speedily as possible during the term of my office as Assistant Magistrate for 12 years, and, as stated in the lucid memorandum of the District Magistrate, both the case and the properties must have been disposed of before I left the Taluk as it was extremely unlikely that the

30

Complainant Subramanya Bhat, whom I fully remember as he is too notorious a Court-bird to be forgotten by any Amildar would (11) have given me and himself rest if the case remained pending without Sufficient Cause

Unfortunately the Judicial Amildar Lakshmana Setti, who might have been able to give Satisfactory explanation with the records bearing on the subject is dead and I cannot remember anything in the matter.

Asst to the Inspector General of Police.

Fair Draft

31

G.R.S. 28]

Police

File No. 1906

Serial No. 420

*Diary No. of letter replied to*_____

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

( )

the 190

Date of issue 29-5-07

Signed by [illegible]

READ.—

Petition dated the 9th July 1906 from Subrahmanya-bhatta of Jaritare praying for the restoration of certain property belonging to him and seized by the Police in connection with a case of theft

~~ORDER THEREON NO.~~

2. Letter no. 309 dated the 5th January 1907 from the Dy. Comr. of the Kadur Dt. forwarding a detailed memo regarding the subject of the above complaint. over

SUBJECT

MGCPB—20,030—21-2-05

32

3 Letter no. 645 dated the 9th April 1907 from the Dt. Magte. of Kadur, forwarding the explanation regarding the above, of Mr. Nadig Subba Rao, Asst. to the I. G. of Police who was the Amildar Magistrate of Tarikere at the time the case arose.

Order thereon. - No. J3585-87 Police Office dt/ 29.5-07

On the 24th June 1902 one Nerlikere Phanigappa of Tarikere complained to the Police of the Tarikere Taluk of theft of some vessels and bundles of papers from his house. The Police took the case on their file as crime no. 0/115/1901-02 ~~dated~~ and subd. a first Information Report to the Amildar Magistrate of Tarikere on the 2nd July 1902. During the course of this investigation, the Police

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

searched the house of the petitioner and seized certain vessels and bundles of papers. Finally, however, they submitted a 'B' report to the magistrate on the 18th January 1903 Mr. Nadig Subba Rao the then Amildar magistrate thereupon passed an order for notice being issued to the complainant to appear on the 13th February 1903 on which date he passed the following order:-

"The complainant is present. He says he has additional evidence to offer There is strong ~~enmity~~ enmity between the parties. The case will be proceeded with vide separate statement" No further action was, however, taken in the matter till Febr 05 when, on the complaint of the petitioner that the property seized from him had not been returned Mr. C.R. Krishna Rao, the then Amildar Magte recorded the statement of the complainant in the case

that owing to the lapse of time he could not adduce any evidence and accepted the "B" report of the Police and also directed the return of all the property connected with the case to the persons from whom they were seized. Some of the articles seized from the petitioner were however not to be found in the court house.

The property seized in connection with the case was sent to the Taluk Police office, but there is no voucher to show that the same was thence forwarded to the magistrate's court. The fact that some of the articles were found in the court seems to show that the whole of the property seized ~~was~~ might have been sent to the court. Amicus Curiae Magte. Mr. C. R. Krishna Rao in his report on the case to the Dt. Magte. expresses the opinion that the missing articles ~~would~~ might have been returned to the petitioner. But in the absence of the petitioner's acknowledgement for having

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation Sheet draft form.)

received the articles it is difficult to say with certainty that they were returned to him. He will be informed that the articles claimed by him cannot be traced.

From the records of the case, the Govt. regret to find that the magisterial work in the Amildar's court seems to have been done in a very haphazard manner. The B" report was received by Mr. Subba Rao on 18-1-03 and the case was posted to 13-2-03 but no Mis case no. was given and no entries were made in the Diary or in the Mis Register of the Court. The statement referred to by Mr. Subba Rao in his order of the 13th February 1903 quoted above, seems to be the paper marked 2/14 in the records, but it is not in Mr. Subba Rao's handwriting nor has he initialled and dated it. The order of 13-2-03 in both the case on the regular

his claim for a returned the same cannot be ignored, and, if the articles are not to be found, the value if missing properly should be recovered from the Police officers concerned and paid to the petr. The Hy. of Police is requested to see that this is done at an early date. He should also take steps to prevent a recurrence of such irregular proceedings on the part of subordinate Police officers.

file was ~~never~~ never given effect to
the property connected with
the case and received in
the court has not been
noted in the Property Register
All these are irregularities
which could not have been
possible if the magistrate
saw that his registers
were written up and signed
from day to day as he was
bound to do.

for Secretary

To

The I.G. of Police in Mysore
The Dt. Magte. Kadur.
with the records

Copies to the Dept of the Govt Court

Copies the typed
one for press
one for Dy. Govt
3 one for Dr. Kadur

Copies

1906-07

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE
(POLICE)

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 29th May 1907

No. J. 3585-87
Police 1-06

Passing orders on the petition of Subramanyabhatta of Tarikere regarding the loss of certain property belonging to him and seized by the Police in connection with a case of theft.

GPB—5-6-07—399

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

READ—

1. Petition dated the 9th July 1906, from Subramanyabhatta of Tarikere, praying for the restoration of certain property belonging to him and seized by the Police in connection with a case of theft.

2. Letter No. 309, dated the 5th January 1907, from the Deputy Commissioner of the Kadur District, forwarding a detailed memo regarding the subject of the above complaint.

3. Letter No. 645, dated the 9th April 1907, from the District Magistrate of Kadur, forwarding the explanation regarding the above, of Mr. Nadig Subba Rao, Assistant to the Inspector-General of Police, who was the Amildar Magistrate of Tarikere at the time the case arose.

No. J. 3585-87—POLICE 1-06, DATED BANGALORE, 29TH MAY 1907.

ORDER THEREON.—On the 24th June 1902, one Nerlikere Phaniyappa of Tarikere complained to the Police of the Tarikere Taluk of theft of some vessels and bundles of papers from his house. The Police took the case on their files as Crime No. 10-115—1901-02 and submitted a first information report to the Amildar Magistrate of Tarikere on the 2nd July 1902. During the course of this investigation, the Police searched the house of the petitioner and seized certain vessels and bundles of papers. Finally, however, they submitted a "B" report to the Magistrate on the 18th January 1903. Mr. Nadig Subba Rao, the then Amildar Magistrate, thereupon passed an order for notice being issued to the complainant to appear on the 13th February 1903, on which date he passed the following order:—

> "The complainant is present. He says he has additional evidence to offer. There is strong enmity between the parties. The case will be proceeded with. *Vide* separate statement."

No further action was, however, taken in the matter till February 1905, when, on the complaint of the petitioner that the property seized from him had not been returned, Mr. C. R. Krishna Rao, the then Amildar Magistrate, recorded the statement of the complainant in the case that owing to the lapse of time he could not adduce any evidence, and accepted the "B" report of the Police and also directed the return of all the property connected with the case to the persons from whom they were seized. Some of the articles seized from the petitioner were, however, not to be found in the Court-house.

The property seized in connection with the case was sent to the Taluk Police Office, but there is no voucher to show that the same was thence forwarded to the Magistrate's Court. The fact that some of the articles were found in the Court seems to show that the whole of the property seized might have been sent to the Court. Amildar Magistrate Mr. C. R. Krishna Rao in his report on the case to the District Magistrate expresses the opinion that the missing articles might have been returned to the petitioner. But in the absence of the petitioner's acknowledgment for having received the articles, his claim for a return of the same cannot be ignored, and, if the articles are not to be found, the value of the missing property should be recovered from the Police officers concerned and paid to the petitioner. The Inspector-General of Police is requested to see that this is done at an early date. He should also take steps to prevent a recurrence of such irregular proceedings on the part of subordinate Police officers.

From the records of the case the Government regret to find that the Magisterial work in the Amildar's Court seems to have been done in a very haphazard manner. The "B" report was received by Mr. Subba Rao on 18th January 1903 and the case was posted to 13th February 1903, but no Miscellaneous case number was given and no entries were made in the Diary or in the Miscellaneous Register of the Court. The statement referred to by Mr. Subba Rao in his order of the 13th February 1903 quoted above, seems to be the paper marked 2-14 in the records, but it is not in Mr. Subba Rao's hand-writing nor has he initialled and dated it. The order dated 13th February 1903 to take the case on the regular file was never given effect to.

Judicial and Legislative (Police), dated 29th May 1907.

The property connected with the case and received in the Court has not been noted in the Property Register. All these are irregularities which could not have been possible if the Magistrate saw that his registers were written up and signed from day to day as he was bound to do.

K. S. CHANDRASEKHARA AIYAR,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Inspector-General of Police in Mysore with records.
The District Magistrate, Kadur.
The Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore.

Exd.—C. R.

Police 1-06
-407
44

J2876 40

సూర్య 3629 తే 31-5-07 File no. 1406
Public Relations Sl no. 1426

ప్రజావేదనసూరు మహాబాంజరవరసంగారద
జనరల్ మేనేజరు సైదాబాదు వరకు
ధరిలిందిలంద -

దిగిదేశి దర్శనం చూచుటకు రాంచుభ్
భ్యరపడగసుబ్బు ర్ధక్కొభ్భరిగి ఇంచా.
ర్ధులేం -.

నిమ్మ చుంచు రాగడపత్రవగ్గశీమా
లునళ్ళన్న పేం లాలసి నవరు ~~తోలుకొన~~
తమ్మ స్నా ధిలస్తశీగకు కోండి ద్ద న్నఈవరి
గుం నారసనా కోండ్ధి ల్లనేంచువగ్గశీనీ
శ్రీ గండంట.నీ ధనిశి జూల్ల్ ~~తాలూ~~ నేతలాశీ
వి నక్ష లూ మేకూం, గండంనో ఇచ్చి నిమీ
ల్ల నేరాశీలవి నేలూం గు జరావలి సి
కోం చంద అజిగళ్ళ శీ పేలంచు రల్లి: -

నిమ్మ మూం లునళ్ళు శ్రీ ద్ధ రపేదల్లి
అన్న గళ్ళ బీలంచున్న ఈ పేం ఇచ్చ మేనసం
బంద తచ్చ పేం లాలసాతిసరు గళ్ళంద
రసుం లాడి దీపేదల్లి నిమగే వాంవతిమండి
న్న ~~బాలాంతాలూ~~ పేం లాలసా ధైర్యశ్రీ ర్ జనరల్
రవరంగే ర్ధుపేం కోం చ్చిరు వసుంగ.శీ శీళి
శ్రీ ధ్రీ -

ధ్ర మేం లజిలాచార్యులం

తమ్మ
తాం సైదాబాదు బీరి.

30-5-07
31/5/07

20 To the I.G of Police, Distt magistrate Kadur and the Registrar, chief Court. Directing the
No 3585-87 d 29/5/07

Direct the I.G. to recover the cost of the property from the Police officers concerned and pay the same to the petitioner and observes that the magisterial work of the Arikere Amildar's Court seems to have been done in a very haphazard manner.

421. From the Petitioner d 12/5/07
A reminder to S No 21.

426. To the Petitioner No 3629 d 31/5/07
Informs him that orders have been issued to the I.G. of Police to recover the value of his lost property from the Police officers concerned and to deliver the same to him